



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

need of some representative organization which could crystallize and express American sentiment in Japan relative to international questions. Twice has the missionary body performed this service, but not without the feeling that if the business and professional men could unite with them in this the cause would be greatly strengthened.

Besides this, there is the fact that while Americans, as well as people of other nationalities, are members of the Japan Peace Society, there is also need of some educational movement which will bring directly to them the best that the world is saying and thinking on the question of peace.

For several months past a Promoting Committee of twenty Americans, representing the professional, missionary and business groups, have been giving the subject careful thought. Among the members of this committee were: E. W. Frazar of the firm of Sale & Frazar, chairman; D. H. Blake, chairman of the Yokohama Foreign Board of Trade and manager for Japan and China of the American Trading Co.; J. R. Kennedy, representative of the Associated Press for Japan and Korea; Drs. S. L. Gulick, J. H. DeForest, A. Oltmans, A. D. Hail, D. C. Greene, J. L. Dearing and G. F. Draper, representing the American Board, the Dutch Reformed, the Presbyterian, the Baptist and the Methodist Missions; Prof. E. H. Vickers, professor of Political Economy in Keio University; C. W. Atkinson of the Standard Oil Co., the Manager of the Standard Oil Co. for Japan; G. S. Phelps, Young Men's Christian Association Secretary; Rev. T. Roseberry Good, pastor of the Union Church, Yokohama; Prof. H. T. Terry of the Law College of the Imperial University; Prof. C. T. Sweet of the American Episcopal Mission, professor in the Higher Normal School; Gilbert Bowles of the Friends' Mission; and H. S. Wheeler of the firm of W. & J. Sloane & Co., Kobe.

In December the Promoting Committee sent to Americans in Japan and Korea a circular stating the nature and work of the proposed organization. Opinions concerning this and the proposed draft of a constitution were sought. Four adverse replies were received. The others all expressed the most cordial approval, which led the committee to call the general meeting for organization.

The American Peace Society of Japan was organized at the rooms of the Foreign Board of Trade, Yokohama, January 30, with a charter membership of one hundred and eighty. The meeting was called to order by the president of the Yokohama Foreign Board of Trade, Mr. D. H. Blake, with whom sat the Hon. Thomas J. O'Brien, the American Ambassador.

The Growth of a Great Movement.*

BY HOWARD EVANS, CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION LEAGUE OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sir Edward Grey's speech has filled every lover of the cause of peace with unbounded gratification. At last we seem to see the dawn of a new era, when justice instead of force shall prevail, and when the toiling millions shall no longer be crushed by the burden of those bloated

armaments which are a disgrace to our civilization. In modern times nations have repeatedly resorted to arbitration for the settlement of minor disputes, but in each case the machinery had to be created. It was necessary to make arbitration permanent by means of treaties and to establish a court to which disputes might be referred. From time to time proposals were put forward in this direction, but little progress was made till the United States and Great Britain set an example to the world by the Geneva arbitration in 1872.

In 1873 Sir Randal Cremer founded the Workmen's Peace Association, now known as the International Arbitration League, which demanded in the first article of its program the establishment of a High Court of Nations for the settlement of disputes. A few of us have lived to strike out that article, because our hopes have been realized by the appointment of the Hague Tribunal.

In 1885 Cremer entered Parliament and took up the work in which Henry Richard had so long labored, so that in 1887 he secured the signatures of two hundred and thirty-two members of Parliament to a memorial to the President and Congress of the United States in favor of an arbitration treaty for the settlement of "any" disputes. Among the signatures were those of Mr. Asquith and Mr. Chamberlain. That same year Mr. Carnegie addressed a meeting of the League in favor of a permanent treaty, at which Mr. Haldane was present. The House of Commons memorial was duly presented at Washington by Cremer and other members of Parliament, to whom President Cleveland returned a sympathetic reply. The result was a concurrent resolution in both the Senate and the House of Representatives in favor of a treaty for the settlement of "any" disputes by arbitration. Shortly after the representatives of seventeen American republics met, under the presidency of Mr. Blaine, and drew up a treaty of arbitration for their own use.

In 1888 Cremer, with the assistance of M. Passy, formed the Interparliamentary Union, composed of members of various parliaments interested in the cause of peace. One of its adherents was Senator Sherman, who wrote Cremer that the next move should be made on the British side. Cremer accordingly, in 1893, moved a resolution in favor of a treaty for the settlement of "any" disputes, which Mr. Gladstone accepted with some slight modifications, and it was passed unanimously. It was on this occasion that Mr. Gladstone expressed the hope that at some future time a council of the great powers would be established. The following year Cremer obtained the signatures of three hundred and fifty-four members of Parliament to a second memorial, which he duly presented at Washington.

Sir Julian Pauncefote, our Ambassador, with whom Cremer was in frequent communication, had set his heart on the completion of such a treaty, and he and Secretary Gresham set to work. When Mr. Gresham died, Secretary Olney was equally in earnest. The treaty was actually agreed upon and signed when a formidable difficulty arose. The United States Senate has large treaty-making powers, and many of its members were jealous of their rights. They insisted on such limitations as would have made a permanent treaty practically unworkable. The ratification of the treaty just missed by three votes the necessary two-thirds majority. The result was, of course, a bitter disappointment to the framers of the treaty, and

* This article is reprinted from one of the London dailies.

especially to Cremer, the more so that President McKinley, though personally favorable, expressed the opinion that any further attempt would be inopportune.

Nevertheless, a further attempt was made in 1908, when a treaty of limited arbitration was drawn up by Secretary Root and Mr. Bryce, our Ambassador, who had the fear of the Senate before their eyes. I well remember how keen was the regret of Cremer that this treaty fell so far short of his ideal, and how I tried to assure him that all the rest would follow in due time.

Since then many things have happened. The international movement in favor of arbitration has gone forward by leaps and bounds. The democracy in all countries has grown increasingly restive under its almost intolerable burdens. Labor and religion are growing more and more international. Last, and not least, the people of the United States are awake to the greatness of their opportunity. A generation ago the peace movement in the United States was confined to amiable enthusiasts who had but small influence in the country. The seed they sowed has not been fruitless.

Only a few years ago the prevailing mood in America was that of benevolent goodwill towards the peace movement; now it has been replaced by ardent enthusiasm. The gathering of the Interparliamentary Union at St. Louis no doubt did much to educate public opinion, especially as the subsequent visit to President Roosevelt was speedily followed by his efforts to stop the horrible carnage of Russians and Japanese. President Taft has gone still further, and already has his reward in the sympathetic response of Sir Edward Grey. The further increase in the navy is deplorable indeed, but the speech of Sir Edward Grey is more than a set-off against it. For a year to come the scaremongers and mischief makers, who are the enemies of every country, especially their own, will have their wasteful and wicked way; the future is not with them, but with us who look forward to the time when man shall dwell "gathering all the fruits of earth and crowned with all her flowers."

Excessive British Naval Estimates.

Dr. Ede, Dean of Worcester, in a letter to Joseph Sturge of Birmingham, thus expresses his disapproval of the excessive British naval estimates for this year:

"*Dear Mr. Sturge:* I agree with you in deploring the action of the government in issuing such excessive naval estimates. Their action in this matter must weaken the confidence and shake the allegiance of a large number of Liberals, and were it not for the present position of the constitutional controversy, many of us would welcome the defeat of a Liberal government which proposes an expenditure apparently so far in excess of the necessity of the occasion, even according to the view of the extreme advocates of a strong navy; for it is now admitted that the scare of two years ago was founded on a misconception, and that the German program had not been accelerated — but that scare led to an acceleration in our program; and now the scare is proved baseless, we have a right to expect that a Liberal government will equalize matters by lessening the pace of construction. If the present navy, which is far stronger relatively than our navy has ever been, is not powerful enough to defend

our shores, when will it be? Is there never to be finality of expenditure? Is every increase of taxation to be absorbed by additional armaments and little or none expended on those social reforms which are overdue, and which the Liberal party exists to forward? We know from the researches of Messrs. Booth and Rowntree the large proportion of our population below the poverty line, unable to provide the bare necessities of healthy life, and the still larger number just above the line who sink below it when any extra pressure occurs. Are we to have a navy equal in power to a combination of any three or four powers and a people impoverished, underfed and housed in slums? But if the home effect of such expenditure is disastrous, the international effect is even worse. How can we expect other nations to believe in our peaceful intentions when they see us building a navy in excess of the needs of defense? Say what we may, they will see in this expenditure evidence that we are contemplating an aggressive policy, and mean to attack some one.

"As many Englishmen regarded the German naval increase as evidence of a design to invade us, so our increased estimates will be regarded by many Germans as proof of our intention to attack them. Far better than this increase in expenditure would be an honest attempt to arrive at an understanding with other nations, and Germany in particular, as to our respective interests in various parts of the world, and to cultivate more friendly relationships."

"Yours faithfully,
The Deanery, Worcester. "W. MOORE EDE."

A Woman's Cry.

How Long, O Lord, How Long? (Isaiah 11: 9.)

BY MARY WIMBORO PLOUGHE.

How long will the nations thou hast ordained
Wear the filthy rags of war,
That drip with a murdered brother's blood,
That stench with a brother's gore?
How long boast their proud enlightenment,
And yet will think it is right
To pillage and burn and rob and starve —
How long this shade of night?
How long, O Lord, how long?
How long will they use their sovereign right
To orphan their little ones?
To blanch the cheeks of their maidens fair,
As they slay each other's sons?
How long from their wives' lips will they wrench
The lonely widow wail,
And plead on it all thy blessing, Lord,
And never before Thee pale?
How long, O Lord, how long?
How long will mothers, down at their knees,
Teach to their sons Thy law,
Then have them snatched, and for greed maybe
Fed to diseases' maw?
And Christian nations send them forth
To be brothers unto the ox?
O Lord, our God, Thou 'lt reign o'er all!
How long this paradox?
How long, O Lord, how long?